

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ERAN RUBINSTEIN, et al.,	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	NO. 09-6065
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
MCNAUL EBEL NAWROT & HELGREN	:	
PLLC, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

O R D E R

AND NOW, this **10th** day of **June, 2011**, upon reviewing Plaintiffs' Motion to Vacate (doc. no. 61) and Defendants' Response (doc. no. 62), it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' Motion to Vacate (doc. no. 61) is **DENIED**.¹

¹ The Court denies Plaintiffs' motion because the purported bases for their challenge do not relate to either the substance of the Court's previous order and thus, they do not relate to the factual or legal reasons for transferring this case. The Court recently transferred two of Plaintiffs' cases (09-3158 & 09-6065) to the Western District of Washington. This motion is in regards to the second case, 09-6065, which was transferred by Court Order on 5/16/2011. Plaintiffs' motion argues that the Order has two mistakes that were intended to prejudice Plaintiffs: (1) that one of the cites is to an Order in the 09-3158 case; and (2) that the title of the Order should have had McNaul listed as the first named Defendant. These issues raised by the Plaintiffs are completely irrelevant as the Court did not rely on either of these facts in determining that this case should be transferred under §1404.

Additionally, as this case is now transferred to the Western District of Washington, this Court no longer has jurisdiction to continue to address any motions or requests from the parties.

It is further **ORDERED** that this case shall be **FORTHWITH
AND IMMEDIATELY TRANSFERRED** to the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington now that the thirty day
waiting period is concluded and Plaintiffs' Motion is denied.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Eduardo C. Robreno
EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.